Jack J. Waite
3423 Cottman Avenue
Philadelphia, Pa. 19149

November 4, 1967

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Many thanks for sending OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS. I am about one-third of the way through it, and I think it is the most interesting book of yours to date. Of course, I suppose it is more interesting to me than your previous works because of the fact that I was fairly familiar with many of the aspects of your previous books, whereas this one is all new to me, and therefore (as far as I am concerned) fresh and interesting.

I thank you for your little note which was enclosed, telling me that you would be on McKinney's program on November 1st. Unfortunately, the book (and your note) did not arrive here until November 2nd, and so I missed you! I do not ordinarilly listen to McKinney (much as I would like to) because I need a certain amount of sleep due to the necessity of going to work the following morning. This is why I never know in advance when you are going to be on. For if I knew you were on, I'd make a special point of listening, regardless of the lack of sleep involved.

I wonder whether I might at some time inconvenience you to the extent of your sending me a copy of the Castro speech of November 23, 1963 which you have printed excerps from in this latest book? Or tell me where I might obtain an accurate copy?

A final favor. You probably don't have time, and if this is too much an imposition, ignore it, but at least I'll make the request. Although I do not have one-one hundreth of your analytical powers, tremendous recall, and intelligence, nevertheless I at least share your interest in the case. You are aware of the depth of my admiration for you and what you are doing, and so I cannot compare myself to you in any way except for the similarity of interest. But, that I do have. The trouble is that as time goes by, there seems to be less and less interest on the part of the pepple I know in the assassination or the solving of it! Whether or not people believe the Warren findings, they seem to be tending to an "I don't care" attitude, and "it's over and done with, so what difference does it make now anyhow?". Several of my friends have told me directly that they are sick and tired of reading or talking of Kennedy. The majority of people tend to believe the propaganda that legitimate investigators like yourself, fall into the same category as Lane, that is "scavengers" - even though tehy have no idea of what they are talking about. What all this is leading up to is the fact that I have no one to talk to or discuss things with any longer. You are entirely too busy and active for me to be bothering you, and besides, I cannot talk to you intelligently because I do not know one-hundredth of what you know. You are professional, I am amateur, you might say. But, my concern and interest is sincere. And, so I would like to contact other people who are (like myself) concerned and interested, but who have not your vast knowledge - for after all, this is now almost your life's work, and so who does know the amount of facts that you know? From your various books,

I assume that you have hundreds of correspondents - also occasional letters of praise and encouragement - from your readers - people like myself. Of these, perhaps you might know of a few who would have an interest in developing a correspondence with me. This would fulfill a need of mine. I am - as I am sure you are well aware - really and truly interested in this case, and in your writings. It is quite frustrating to know of no one who shares your interests. I would especially like to get into contact with other people who are similarly interested in your work, who are single. This is because I am no longer married, and have the time to correspond and read anything that might be recommended to me. Other single people would have the same advantage, whereas married people probably would not, unless the couple happens to share this particular interest. So, if (in your mailing files) you are aware of any single people, male or female, who share my interest, and who you think might be willing to correspond with me, who knows but that you might be the means of a life-long friendship? I would seriously appreciate it, Mr. Weisberg. You might either send me some names and addresses - or if you would not like to do that, perhaps when you send replies to people when answering your mail, you might let them know that I am interested in making such contacts, and ask them if they'd be willing to correspond with me. I'd truly appreciate this.

In regard to my last letter, and your reply to it - I had asked you upon what you based your conclusion that the shirt worn by Lovelady in the exhibit you printed is the same shirt he wore on the day of the assassination. You replied that you did not recall your clue. I have searched around, and perhaps I did a bum job, but I have not been able to find anything documented which says the shirt in the photo is the shirt Lovelady wore the day of the assassination. If, in fact, the shirts are identical, then you have proved an irrefutable point - the man in the doorway in the Atglens photo is not Lovelady. But, if you are mistaken in thinking that the shirt(s) are identical, then it is still possible that the government is correct. You see the importance of this, of course. In the many arguments I have had, wherein I use your book as proof that Oswald was probably in the doorway at the time of the shooting, and therefore could not be on the 6th floor firing away, I have been questioned repeatedly - people ask "Whose word do you have but Weisberg's?" And, this may well be my own fault, because I may have missed your documentation in spite of my searching. Sometimes the thing right under your nose is the thing you can't see. But, that was the reason for my question, and if you find the answer, I'll appreciate it.

All your books are informative and a break-through. Some day, historians who are more interested in actual history than legend will credit your efforts. But, this book is one of, if not the, best - in my opinion. I can't wait for the next one. God bless you.

Yours sincerely,

Jack

P.S. The other day I met Arlen Specter. He thanked me for the endorsement my paper gave him - (as if I had anything to do with it!) - Little does he know I am voting against him come next Tuesday, specifically because of his involvement with the "single bullet theory" and his refusal to meet and debate with you. - Jack